

Online Research @ Cardiff

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/101431/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Moragues Faus, Ana ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7926-6394> 2017. Problematising justice definitions in public food security debates: towards global and participative food justices. *Geoforum* 84 , pp. 95-106. 10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.06.007 file

Publishers page: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.06.007>
<<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.06.007>>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies.

See

<http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



Problematizing justice definitions in public food security debates: towards global and participative food justices

Ana Moragues-Faus

In: Geoforum

Problematising justice definitions in public food security debates: towards global and participative food justices.

In the current environment of austerity, social justice concerns are increasingly permeating the food security agenda. However, there is a need to clarify what it means to create socially just food systems conceptually and practically. To address this gap, this paper proposes an analytical framework to embed a more complex conceptualisation of justice in food security debates that also serves as a bridging device across competing narratives. This framework is mobilised to analyse the framing process of the UK media, which plays a key role in developing narratives that provide audiences with schemas for interpreting events. Results show the emergence of eleven frames which highlight different solutions to deliver food security. The application of the justice analytical framework evidences the contingent relationship between food security and justice claims and discusses how these food security frames address differently what counts as a matter of justice (including economic, socio-cultural and political dimensions) and who counts as a subject of justice, tackling issues around delimitation of scales and sites of justice. The analysis reveals polarised positions between whether the sites subject to justice should be individuals or structures and uncovers how political and global elements of justice are largely by-passed in food security debates. These conceptualisations of justice and associated policy recommendations neglect the potential for people to participate fully in the conditions and decisions that give rise to particular distributions of goods and bads in the first place; limiting the construction of shared responsibilities to deliver global and participative food justices.

Key words: justice, food security, global food justice, frames, media, participative approaches

1. Introduction

Rising levels of obesity sitting alongside staggering undernutrition numbers situate food insecurity - or the inability of people to regularly access sufficient nutritious and culturally acceptable food – as one of the main social challenges of our time. Increasingly, the delivery of good food for all has been regarded as “impossible without social justice” (Cadieux and Slocum, 2015:3). Given the multifaceted processes and the complexity that

characterises food security dynamics, developing a successfully resilient and equitable global food system requires high levels of interaction between diverse stakeholders and a commitment to flexibility and learning in order to produce effective collective responses (Misselhorn et al., 2012). However, so far, solutions and conceptualisations - envisaged from policy, academic spheres and lobby groups - have mostly revolved around oppositional narratives (e.g. efficiency vs sufficiency, productivist vs demand-led) reproducing old dichotomies (e.g. production vs consumption, rural vs urban, local vs global, protectionism vs free trade, etc.) that are unable to address the systemic nature of the global food crisis and its unjust outcomes (Freibauer et al., 2011; Sonnino et al., 2014; Lang and Barling, 2012). This paper explores further how these competing food security narratives support or hinder the creation of socially just food systems conceptually and practically.

Recently, there has been a growing body of work around food security framings that aims to unblock this polarised debate and gain an in-depth understanding of narrative formation and its policy implications. Framing is “to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation” (Entman, 1993: 52). Of particular interest is Mooney and Hunt's (2009) examination of food security as a consensus frame - that is, as a term that finds broad acceptance and consent but that is used to make different claims which result in divergent policy positions to address food insecurity. These can range from supporting genetic engineered technology to advocating for land reform. In the UK context, Kirwan and Maye (2013) use the food security consensus frame to scrutinise the relationship between scale and framing, paying particular attention to the polarisation between the ‘official’ UK discourse – which supports sustainable intensification, market liberalisation and risk management policies (see also MacMillan & Dowler 2012) - and the side-lined proposals of local food systems advocates. These studies highlight how food security discourses have the capacity to produce social realities (see also Nally, 2014), which then translate into targets for policy interventions having implications for people’s wellbeing (Sonnino et al., 2016).

Despite the insights gained from previous framing analysis, an emerging food security agenda is calling for an examination of the relationality and potential convergence of

different narratives and associated interests in order to deliver good food for all (Jarosz, 2014; Hopma and Woods, 2014). For example, Sonnino et al (2016) recently analyse the distinct governance frameworks embedded in food security narratives in order to investigate their potential integration. However, there is a need to explore further key concepts that can serve as bridging devices in the entrenched food security debate, and how those concepts are mobilised across different constituencies and deliberation spaces (i.e. academia, policy arenas, social movements and the general public). In this paper, I contribute to this agenda by focusing on social justice, a concept that has recently been recognised as one of the necessary starting points to analyse, and explore solutions to, food insecurity (Cadiex and Slocum, 2015: 3).

Furthermore, in the context of economic crisis and austerity measures, both food security and social justice have also become more prominent in public debates of developed countries such as the UK, fuelled by reported increases in food poverty and inequality (see for example Oxfam and Church Action, 2013; Kneafsey et al., 2013). Particularly, social justice has become a fuzzy and ubiquitous word to qualify food poverty or food security challenges, seldom defined in the academic literature, policy arenas or media outlets. For example, Godfray et al (2010:818) state in an agenda setting Science paper that the food security challenge now also requires the delivery of social justice outcomes. Similarly, the European Commission (2010:1) argues that “global health improvement depends on greater social justice”; or as Oxfam (2013:7) puts it, the answer to hunger and poverty “it’s simply justice”. The limited engagement of these assertions with the rich literature on (social) justice¹ poses a risk of generating a new consensus frame where ‘justice’ is invoked as an abstract call for fairness. As Loo (2014) identifies, scholars’ efforts have been concentrated in understanding distributive food disparities leading to a narrow conceptualisation of justice that tends to by-pass the root causes of inequality. By unpicking the connections between food security and the justice literature, through this piece of research I set out to address recent calls for a more rigorous scholarship that engages in clarifying what it means to create socially just food systems (Cadioux and Slocum, 2015).

¹ In many cases authors such as Fraser and Young use indistinctively the notion of justice and social justice. There are authors who advocate the use of justice when applied to individuals and social justice when referring to society. In this paper I use justice in order to integrate all the possible subjects and matters of justice.

This paper aims to problematise the concept of justice in order to foster progress in current food security debates. The main objective of this piece of work is to embed a more complex and reflexive conceptualisation of justice that allows critical evaluation of existing narratives and provides new elements to help in unblocking entrenched food policy positions. Questions such as what are the different conceptualisations of justice in food security debates, how different food security narratives converge and diverge around particular justice dimensions, and how these distinct justice definitions underpin support for particular policy solutions; are instrumental to assessing the potential contribution of notions of justice to the food security agenda. For that purpose, section two presents a literature review on justice and its intersections with food security, outlining an analytical framework to examine key elements in the process of constructing justice definitions. This framework illustrates the way in which different perspectives address what counts as a matter of justice (including economic, socio-cultural and political dimensions) and who counts as a subject of justice, tackling issues around delimitation of scales and sites of justice.

In order to understand how different justice definitions are mobilised, I apply this analytical framework to the UK public food security debate. The analysis of media outlets constitutes an innovation given the lack of food security frame analysis of non-policy communications (with some exceptions, see Wells and Caraher(2014)). Furthermore, the mass media constitutes a key framing actor (see Herman and Chomski, 1988), actively intervening in people's environment by creating public narratives that provide audiences with schemas for interpreting events, that is, framings (Iyengar, 1994; Pan and Kosicki, 1993). For example, Sampei & Aoyagi-Usui (2009) found a direct correlation between newspaper coverage on climate change and an increase of awareness of the public, which was instrumental in the implementation of environmental policies by the Japanese government to cut emissions. The framing and presentation of events and news in the mass media can thus systematically affect how recipients of the news come to understand these events galvanising support for specific policies or interventions. Or in other words, "frames influence opinions by stressing specific values, facts, and other considerations, endowing them with greater apparent relevance to the issue than they might appear to have under an alternative frame" (Nelson et al., 1997:569).

The UK media analysis consisted of two-steps. First, 475 text units were analysed from eight main British newspapers² published in the 2010-2014 period. The text units were selected from the lexis-nexis database by entering 'food security' or 'food poverty' as key words which resulted in a total of 2572 articles. The text units were selected according to their relevance, source, topic and number of articles in that source. Following Candel et al., (2014), an inductive frame analysis was applied using the qualitative software NVIVO to code problem definitions, proposed solutions and moral bases displayed in the different newspaper articles. The eleven resulting frames were discussed through semi-structured phone interviews with six experts representing non-governmental organisations and institutions working on sustainable development/sustainable food, trade unions, anti-poverty campaigners, academics and agricultural experts. These interviews were instrumental in the establishment of connections among frames and in the discussion of their relevance in public and political debates. Section three discusses these eleven food security framings constructed in the UK media with the objective of gaining an in-depth understanding of narrative formation and its policy implications. Section four presents the second analytical phase, where these eleven frames are further examined under the justice framework proposed to understand how food security debates operationalise different definitions of justice. Using justice as a bridging concept, section five discusses the emergence of two main justice narratives in UK popular debates and their (dis)connections with the justice literature. Finally, section six outlines the conclusions of the paper highlighting how superficial approaches to justice can hinder the delivery of good food for all.

2. An analytical framework to problematise justice narratives

Food security is widely acknowledged as "a situation that exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life"(FAO, 2002). This definition appeals to basic notions of equality. In fact, food security is increasingly associated with notions of sustainability and justice, acknowledging that

² The newspapers selected were the Guardian, Telegraph, The Sun, The observer, The Independent, The evening standard, Daily Mail and The Mirror.

food systems that are environmentally sound but socially unacceptable would not be resilient in the future and vice versa (Garnett and Godfray, 2012; Sonnino et al., 2014). In this regard, by and large, social movements, policy makers and academics resort to social justice as a way of qualifying food security. For example, Kirwan and Maye (2013) call for an ‘official’ UK interpretation of food security that “better accommodates social justice imperatives” (p.98), while others identify specific social justice issues such as farmworker rights, economic concentration and hunger (Clancy, 1994). However, even when considering the different narratives under the food security consensus frame, there are difficulties to explicitly define justice, treating the term as a broadly shared antidote to distinct inequalities (based on race, class, gender, etc.) and generally promoting progressive rather than radical change (see for example Alkon, 2014; Holt Gimenez and Shattuck, 2011).

In the study of the intersections between food security and justice the concept of *food justice* holds particular interest. This concept emerges out of diverse social and environmental justice concerns to highlight distinct socio-economic, racial and cultural inequalities within the food system. Food justice is intimately associated with a section of the US food movement that aims to combat causes, processes and outcomes that create food inequalities (Agyeman and McEntee, 2014), “ensuring that the benefits and risks of where, what, and how food is grown and produced, transported and distributed, and accessed and eaten are shared fairly” (Gottlieb and Joshi, 2010:6). Nevertheless, different voices raise concerns over the multiple meanings and interpretations of food justice (Gottlieb and Joshi, 2010; Sbicca, 2012), as well as its focus on consumption, access, race and class; generally privileging the local and micro-scale practices ahead of a more comprehensive and multilevel account of the food system (Cadieux and Slocum, 2015; Jarosz, 2014). As Cadieux and Slocum (2015:15) put it “if food justice means anything, it may stand for nothing—or, worse, serve to undermine the credibility and rigor of substantive food justice practices”. Accordingly, they call for more clarity around what it means to create socially just food systems including a more rigorous food justice scholarship and activism that discloses how increasing ‘food justice’ claims actually further justice.

In order to do so, there is a need to reconnect ‘food justice’ and other food claims (food security, food sovereignty, the right to food, food democracy, etc. see Sonnino et al.,

(2016) for a recent review) with the vast literature that problematises the concept of justice more generally. In this section I outline debates and key contributions on justice from political philosophy, social science and geographical literature. This allows us to identify different dimensions of justice which are instrumental to broadening narrow definitions that have prevailed in food debates (Loo, 2014).

2.1 From distributive justice to productive justice

Political scientist John Rawls (1971) reinvigorated the debate on social justice in the 1970s, defining social justice as fairness. Stemming from this definition, he proposed a way to design a system of justice, invoking the notion of a 'veil of ignorance' on the initial endowments of different people, to ensure that the distribution of goods and bads is as equitable as possible. This 'fair equality of opportunity' principle is complemented by a 'difference principle' that only permits inequalities that work to the advantage of the worst-off. Equality is then the logical definition of justice as well as the guiding principle for an appropriate system of justice.

This idea of *distributive justice*, that is, of justice as distributing the goods and bads that we have been assigned arbitrary at birth, has received criticisms from different fronts. First, *Marxist or radical* critics posit questions around the object of justice, that is, what needs to be equalised (i.e. outcomes or opportunities), and how to deal with spatial, temporal and social unevenness in the process of defining equal goods and bads. In this context, Harvey (1992) calls for the application of historical-geographical materialist methods to understand the production of power differentials that result in distinct conceptions of justice mobilised by diverse groups in the struggle for ideological hegemony. Consequently, considering justice as a universal principle is problematic since there are competing interpretations of good and bad that need to be acknowledged. In this line, the prominent political philosopher Iris Marion Young (1990) developed an early *post-structural* critique highlighting the politics of difference at play and stressing the difficulties associated with constructing a theory of justice to become a universal standard for evaluating institutions and relations. Young (1990) defines justice as the elimination or reduction of oppression, which has five faces – exploitation, marginalisation, powerlessness, cultural imperialism and violence. Finally, and likened to

the development of the *capabilities* approach (see Nussbaum, 2003), Sen (2009) recently formulated a theory of justice “that aims to clarify how we can proceed to address questions of enhancing justice and removing injustice, rather than to offer resolutions of questions about the nature of perfect justice” (p. ix). His proposal is to build a comparative approach that allows us to assess the justice of a situation or process by reference to other situations without having a perfect theory.

Taken together, these criticisms led to a formulation of *productive or participative justice* approaches that highlight not only the redistribution of material resources, but also the need to recognise different realities and allow them to participate in the development of institutions (O'Connor, 1998). In this line, Fraser (2008) defines justice as parity of participation, identifying economic, cultural and political obstacles that prevent people from participating as full partners in social interaction.

2.2 A framework to unpack justice narratives

The analysis of different conceptualisations of justice prompts us to identify two main challenges in defining justice: *what* counts as a matter of justice and *who* counts as a subject of justice. These challenges are examined below, and constitute a framework to analyse how justice narratives are constructed.

2.2.1 The what of justice

Fraser (2008) proposes three dimensions to address what counts as a matter of justice. These three dimensions are directly linked to the evolution of theoretical approaches to justice as succinctly summarised above, but also highlight key elements at play when constructing a justice narrative. The first dimension relates to the economic elements of justice, where distributive justice scholars have made an important contribution. Debates around the economic dimension of justice include supporters of equalising *outcomes* but also scholars that emphasise the importance of applying justice parameters to redistribute *opportunities* (Waterstones, 2009).

The second dimension relates to cultural aspects of justice, championed by post-structuralist critics who argue for the *recognition of difference* in front of universalising and sometimes blanket approaches in defining equality and fairness. Young (1990) addresses the importance of difference and identifies cultural imperialism as an essential

face of oppression, that is, how dominant groups construct a social hierarchy of difference by portraying their experiences and cultural products as superior. This hierarchy creates moral norms that condition the identification of injustices. Nevertheless, Smith (2000) points out that recent preoccupation with difference can ultimately be divisive, with the risk of eroding “the sense of human sameness or close similarity to ground a broader egalitarian project” (p.1151). Smith draws on the foundations of human sameness - including aspects of care and human needs - to call for a wider recognition of *sameness* in justice evaluations without abandoning the awareness of the particularity of persons and places brought by post-structuralist contributions.

Finally, there is also a *political* dimension when defining the matter of justice. Early conceptualisations of distributive justice revolve around the *application* of justice principles. However, as O'Connor (1998) points out, any definition of justice striving for equality should include the process of *production* of justice. This participatory or productive approach to social justice aims to include the potential for people to participate fully in the conditions, situations and decision that give rise to particularly distributions of goods and bads in the first place. For example, environmental justice claims are not only about redistributions of goods and bads, but also about whose values and visions of the environment are recognised as well as who participates in decision-making and deliberation spaces (Martinez-Alier, 2014; Moragues-Faus and Morgan, 2015; Sikor and Newell, 2014). One of the main characteristics of political injustice is, therefore, misrepresentation, where miss-framing - or “when questions of justice are wrongly framed in a way that exclude some from consideration” (Faser, 2008:19) - constitutes a key mechanism to create injustice. This miss-framing not only applies to what counts as a matter of justice but also who counts as a subject of justice, which includes defining who is affected by given structures and therefore holds a moral standing as a subject of justice in relation to it (see Barnett, 2012).

2.2.2 *The who of justice*

The second key challenge in defining justice approaches revolves around determining who counts as a subject of justice, which includes clarifying the sites and the scales of justice. When demarcating the *sites of justice*, Barnett (2011) identifies two main focuses

in current moral and philosophical debates, either emphasising the coercive institutions of the basic *structure* or the non-coercive fields of *personal* conduct and ethos. In the first group, Rawls (1999) argues that the subject of justice should be the institutions of society which sustain inequalities - what he called the basic structure of society - while individual choices and attitudes should not be subject to the principles of justice. On the contrary, Cohen (2009) supports the inclusion of non-coercive structures - such as conventions, social ethos and personal choices - in the evaluation of justice. Young (2011) breaks this polarised debate to call for a more complex analysis of injustice that posits the individual as the central locus of ethical responsibility but also recognises the central role of structures in producing injustices. She calls for a shared responsibility, a model in which responsibility is distributed across complex networks of causality and agency (Barnett, 2011; Young, 2007). According to this model, being responsible means that “one has an obligation to join with others in order to transform the structural processes to make their outcomes just” (Young, 2011:96).

Defining the sites subject to justice is closely related to problematising the *scales or the scopes of justice*. The scales of obligations of justice are widely considered to be defined by membership to a particular political community, mainly the *nation-state* (Miller, 2008; Rawls, 1971). This Rawlsian position basically holds that “obligations of justice with other human beings presuppose the existence of shared political institutions” (Young, 2011:136), and therefore *global* distributive justice could only rely on the possibility of a global basic structure (Buchanan, 2003; Pogge, 2002; see Barnett, 2011 for a debate on the existence of a global institutional order). However, critics of this position highlight the arbitrary membership to a nation-state from a moral point of view, stressing the role of power in the evolution of political communities and boundaries (Young, 2011). Furthermore, relationships between people can be unjust without political institutions that govern them and, at the same time, non-governmental collective actors can have an important role in the creation of injustices. Indeed, current globalising processes – including discourses of justice and corresponding institutional arrangements but also capitalist developments (Fraser, 2008; Sikor and Newell, 2014) – have reshaped existing forms of inequality and modified the spaces available for the pursuit of justice beyond Westphalian states (Newell, 2012).

In contrast, other authors support a cosmopolitan-utilitarian view where moral agents have obligations to all human and even non-human beings (Singer, 1993; Unger, 1996). This stance also receives criticism for being overly individualistic, disregarding the roles of institutions and collective action as well as failing to propose specific actions. In the face of these two conceptions, Young (2011) argues for a shared responsibility of all agents contributing to structural processes involved in reproducing injustice. Those processes cut across jurisdictional boundaries creating moral geographies as illustrated by the environmental justice scholarship that demonstrates how “place-specific policies and practices can have consequences that cross national boundaries, affect multiple scales, and extend across global networks” (Holifield et al., 2009: 595).

This review of justice conceptualisations allows the construction of an analytical framework to examine justice narratives. Table 1 summarises the dimensions involved in developing these narratives, as well as key questions and debates on the who and what of justice. This analytical framework constitutes a tool to navigate conflicting views, establish new connections among narratives and support the development of more complex accounts of justice in different food security approaches as discussed below.

Table 1. Summary of the analytical framework to identify key justice challenges and its constitutive dimensions

Challenges	Dimensions	Key questions and debates
The what of justice	Economic: Redistribution	Do narratives champion equalisation of <i>outcomes</i> (final goods enjoyed) and/or equalisation of <i>opportunities</i> (possibilities of access)?
	Social and cultural: Recognition	Do narratives emphasise <i>sameness</i> of all humans and/or they call for recognition of <i>difference</i> (e.g. vulnerable groups)?
	Political: Representation	Do narratives consider the <i>application</i> of justice principles (by who, to who) and/or do they problematise the process of <i>producing justice</i> (who participates in defining justice)?
The who of justice	Scales of justice	Do narratives refer to <i>national</i> boundaries (linked to the capacity of the national state to act, e.g. legislate) and/or do they include <i>global</i> perspectives (other geographies are implicated in defining and applying justice principles)?
	Sites of justice	Do narratives consider the <i>structures</i> of the basic society as the places to apply justice principles and/or they focus on <i>individuals</i> when evaluating justice?

Source: Author's own elaboration

3. UK media food security framings: a segmented discursive foodscape

The UK is a particularly interesting example to study food security frames given its combination of increasing dependency on food imports since the 1980s - which today constitute 40% of all food consumed in the UK (DEFRA, 2014a) – as well as rising numbers of people experiencing diet-related diseases and food poverty. In England, 64% of the population is overweight, with low-income families being particularly affected (HSE, 2013). Unsurprisingly, one of the main concerns now for the UK's population is food prices, which have increased by 18% in real terms between 2007 and 2012, affecting mainly low-income households (DEFRA, 2014b). Government figures estimate that there are around 13 million people in poverty in the UK, that is, one in five people (Department for Work and Pensions, 2014). Alternative sources state that four million people suffer from food poverty (Gordon et al., 2000) and that around three million people suffer from undernourishment or are at risk of being underfed (Brotherton et al., 2010). There has been an expansion of charity-run food banks around the UK, with estimates of around 500,000 residents are now reliant on food aid; and the Trussell Trust food banks have

delivered 3 days emergency food to 913,138 people in 2013/2014 (Lambie-Mumford et al.,2014).

The media has been active in reporting some of these trends, and particularly the food banks surge (Wells and Caraher, 2014). The analysis of the UK media framing process from 2010 until 2014 resulted in the identification and characterisation eleven food security frames. Following the methodology of Candel et al. (2014), the table below summarises these frames, including the way in which each frame defines food insecurity as a problem and identifies related threats, key concepts and associated solutions suggested with examples of specific policies, and the moral bases mobilised.

Table 2 Food security (FS) frames emerging from UK media analysis

Frames	Problems definition/threats	Key concepts / suggested solutions	Policies	Moral bases
Distributive justice	Increasing social inequalities, Violence and riots, Economic crisis, Cuts to public expenditure, Tax avoidance.	People are arbitrarily born with distinct endowments. This is unfair and needs to be corrected in order to deliver FS for all. Redistribution and effective welfare enable FS.	Increase minimum wage/living wages. Reform welfare state.	We are arbitrarily endowed with different resources and skills. These should be redistributed fairly. Social justice as fairness and equality.
Ecological	Soil fertility loss, Pollution, Climate change, Pressures on biodiversity.	Sustainable food production.	Organic and environmentally friendly production practices. Animal Welfare.	Inter-generational sustainability, Respect for nature, Eco-centrism.
Food safety	Spread of animal & plant diseases, Food chain complexity & inefficiencies, Food contamination, Cuts on public expenditure.	Food safety standards are key for national FS.	Increase controls of food safety.	Scientific evidence, Hygienic-sanitary measures to ensure public health.
Free trade	Dependency on food imports and international trade, Price volatility and surge, Food chain complexity & inefficiencies, Spread of animal & plant diseases, Food contamination.	Relying on competitive advantage theories and creating global food chains is the way to assure an efficient and affordable food provision for all.	Liberalise trade.	Freedom of choice, Efficiency.
Individualistic	Economic crisis, Short term crisis, Welfare dependency.	People are responsible for their own choices and associated consequences, therefore they are the ones responsible for assuring FS in their households.	Reduce welfare state, Achieve high levels of employment.	Individual freedom and responsibility.
Productionist	Climate change and bad weather, Spread of animal & plant diseases, Population growth, Violence and riots, Anti-GM lobby.	Stimulating production and increasing productivity.	Invest in sustainable intensification techniques. Invest in technologies to increasing yields.	Every country should be involved in producing more food and increase yields, using technological advances.
Quality	Unsustainable purchasing & eating practices, Increasing social inequalities, Economic crisis, Prices.	Having access to nutritious, healthy and good food.	Promotion of local foods. Promotion of east well guides, eat five a day.	Nutritious food as a right for everybody. Promoting local/national and

				indigenous food as part of the rural landscape, preserving identity.
Regulatory	Dependency on food imports and international trade, Price volatility and surge, Food chain complexity & inefficiencies, Unsustainable purchasing & eating practices, Food fraud and crime, Increasing social inequalities, Food industry lobbying & advertisement, Tax avoidance.	Markets work inefficiently since they do not consider environmental, social and economic externalities or the fulfilment of the right to food. Governments are responsible for people's FS.	Protectionist measures. Grants and payments to protect and support national markets and producers. Sugar and unhealthy food taxes. Regulate advertisement.	State as steward of its citizens, responsible for delivering rights.
Solidarity ³	Increasing social inequalities, Population growth, Price surges, Economic crisis.	People should help each other to achieve FS, building a "Big society". Food assistance is an expression of this community and solidarity spirit delivering short-term and effective solutions for people in need.	Empower communities, devolve resources.	Human solidarity, community spirit, compassion.
Sovereignty	Increasing social inequalities, Food industry lobbying & advertisement, Dependency on food imports and international trade, Economic crisis, Land competition, Food chain complexity & inefficiencies, Financial speculation, Cuts in public expenditure, GMs.	People and communities must have control over their food systems in order to deliver FS.	Provide rights to people (access to land, water, seeds etc.). Protect local economies through trade barriers.	Right to decide on the food system, tackle power imbalances.
Technology	Low farming productivity, Soil fertility loss, Population growth, Climate change and bad weather, Anti-GM lobby.	New technological developments would deliver FS for all.	Invest and deregulate the development of new technologies.	Scientific evidence, Efficiency, Freedom of choice.

³ This frame is named 'solidarity' in order to reflect the descriptors used in the media articles analysed. However, this definition of solidarity represents only one of the manifold meanings and practices of solidarity linked to food insecurity or food poverty dynamics. For example other radical approaches to solidarity or community building rooted in anarchist principles such as food not bombs (see Heynen (2010)) are by and large absent in print media outlets.

According to experts interviewed, these frames “capture the areas where conversation and controversies hinge” in the UK food security debate. These frames show the complexity of food security narratives and the current segmentation of food debates that, among other limitations, preclude holistic accounts of food security challenges. This lack of holistic understanding is clearly exemplified by the suggested solutions presented by these narratives which tend to deal with specific aspects such as food safety, boosting production or improving welfare assistance. However, there are clear correlations among the different frames, many of them sharing the identification of key problems and in some cases elements of the moral basis. Indeed, when presented with these frames several respondents identified two main sets of frames that impinge on national policy debates reproducing the polarised positions outlined in the literature (see above). On the one hand the productionist, free trade and technology frames were acknowledged as the main drivers of national policy (and also European policy) which one expert described as a “consistent policy position with regard to food production, food systems and the food economy”. On the other hand, a second set of frames is made up of ecological, regulatory and distributive justice narratives; championed by a diverse set of charities, NGOs and think tanks in the UK.

Experts showed a range of moral and justice concerns when asked about the relevance of these frames in public debates. For example, an interviewee supporting a mixture of productionist, free trade and technology frames to address food security challenges asserted that the UK “is benign when it comes to social justice. I think there is a general socio-democratic feel about the way you look at food as sort of an essential part of life”. On the contrary, another informant downplayed the role of these three frames resorting as well to justice claims and stating that “the productionist and the technology narrative are quite powerful because it is quite emotive to say we can feed hungry people and we can do it now. But now is not about a fair distribution of nutrition, it is about profits.” In order to understand better these linkages between food security and justice, the next section analyses in depth how different definitions of justice are mobilised in the UK media food security frames.

4. What do you mean by justice?

This section presents the results of the analysis of the UK food security frames under the justice analytical framework proposed in section two. The main aim is to understand how food security frames converge and diverge around particular justice dimensions, and, how these distinct justice definitions underpin support for particular policy solutions.

4.1 The matter of justice: economic, socio-cultural and political dimensions of justice in UK media food security frames

The individualistic and the distributive justice frame are particularly engaged with defining what is the matter of justice, while the other frames generally position themselves around specific dimensions. The *individualistic frame* conceptualises the matter of justice as the equalisation of opportunities that arises from freedom of choice and de-regulation. Food insecurity is, therefore, the result of making the wrong individual choices, like purchasing the wrong foods, spending money on the wrong goods (e.g. TVs) or not working hard enough (see figure 1). This narrative enhances the sameness of individuals and individual rights, claiming that we all are free to make our own decisions and (in the UK) have similar basic conditions to fulfil our needs. Cultural recognition is therefore overlooked within this frame, avoiding any reference to distinct needs and values that groups in society might hold. This sameness resonates as fairness to part of the population, although in some cases is constructed in opposition to others, such as highlighting the use of foodbanks by immigrants (see for example *The unpalatable truth about food banks the left finds so hard to swallow Daily Mail 13/05/2014*) or stressing the wealth of the UK in front of other countries. Therefore, the initial premise of the sameness of individuals is frequently jeopardised by constructions of ‘us’ and the ‘others’, raising questions about who is deserving or entitled to share this sameness.

Figure 1. Headlines related to the individualistic frame



The *free trade* frame also champions the distribution of opportunities and appeals to sameness, in this case calling for all countries to participate under equal trade conditions in the global market. Based on the comparative advantage theory proposed by David Ricardo, the definition of food security under this frame is that free flow of goods allows food to be produced at the lowest possible cost, building global food chains that assure efficient and affordable food provision for all and providing business opportunities. Similarly to the individualistic frame, this definition of justice resonates with the neo-liberal project (Ferguson, 2010), reinforcing the expression of people's freedom of choice through the market. Also, these two frames do not consider the different initial endowments of individuals or countries that might jeopardise ideals of sameness when participating for example in the so-called free markets.

Contrastingly, the *distributive justice frame* as deployed in the media appeals to fairness and equality, calling for a redistribution of goods and bads that lead not only to better opportunities but that result in fairer outcomes. The definition of the what of justice,

therefore, has an important economic dimension that coalesces around policy demands to have an effective welfare system and assure living wages. In fact, much of the rhetoric around this distributive justice frame refers to austerity measures such as benefits cuts and delays as a generator of food insecurity in the UK. This position has been reinforced by investigations on food banks showing that many of their users are suffering from changes in welfare payments (Lambie-Mumford et al., 2014, Oxfam and Church Action, 2013). While this frame is sensitive to different groups and needs - showcasing a number of individual's situations such as single mothers or disabled people - it does not unpack culturally diverse definitions of what is good food for all. In common with the individualistic frame, notions of sameness are also brought to the fore, highlighting different life stories and the idea that 'it might happen to you' (see for example article *Food poverty: 'You think it doesn't happen to normal people' The Guardian 06/06/2013*).

Figure 2. Headlines related to the distributive justice frame⁴



⁴ The image of the front page of the Daily Mirror shows a child crying. Following UNICEF ethical guidelines, this figure does not show the child's face to avoid further stigmatisation of an image that has become iconic in the UK food poverty debate.

The analysis of the media food security frames under the justice framework reveals that practically none of them referred to the political dimension of justice or acknowledged (mis)representation mechanisms. Even in the distributive justice frame, there is an absence of contestation or reflection regarding how people suffering from food poverty are represented in this narrative, using (strategically) the rise of food bank users as a means to gather support for specific policies such as benefit reforms or living wage campaigns. Moreover, the participation of food insecure people in producing - and not only benefiting from - a more just system is seldom discussed. The only frame explicitly tackling issues of empowerment and participation is the *sovereignty frame* which argues for people and communities to regain control over their food systems in order to deliver food security. However, in the UK context food sovereignty is rarely discussed in the media apart from international events related to La Via Campesina and as an umbrella term to amalgamate a myriad of food initiatives.

The diverse strands of independent, sustainable and organic food producers are, at present, little more than a glimmer of light in the gloom, but they may represent the beginnings of a movement for food sovereignty, restoring the connection between the people of this country and more democratic ownership of the chain that brings food from the fields to our kitchens (The Guardian, 26/03/2014)

The food sovereignty frame relies on the right to decide over how food is produced and accessed. This clearly aims to tackle power imbalances as a precondition to delivering sustainability, justice, and ultimately food security for all. However, there are conceptual and practical gaps in linking these global goals to the needs of people actually suffering from food insecurity within the UK.

Other frames do not engage directly in participation issues but draw attention to key aspects of the political process of defining justice. For example, the *ecological frame* highlights intergenerational aspects of sustainability and therefore the need to establish a temporal dimension in the formulation of policy solutions. In the case of the *technological and safety frames*, they make explicit references to application mechanisms of justice; specifically, they share a strong focus on scientific evidence as the basis to guide decision making.

The Government has a position on GM foods which is, provided that it's used safely and responsibly, it can deliver benefits and help address the challenge of global food security. We have to ensure public safety and take decisions based on the scientific evidence (Daily Mail, 11/12/2012).

The technological frame deploys a particular definition of scientific evidence, including only experts and mostly natural science findings. Science is therefore seen as an objective and impartial tool to guide policy, and opponents to developments such as bio-technology are seen as having a lack of scientific understanding. This frame rarely includes as scientific evidence studies that highlight socio-cultural impacts of technology or the development of low-cost techniques and knowledge. Nevertheless, the *safety frame* includes reports and inquiries that rely on socio-economic data as scientific evidence and also highlights the importance of public perception in policy making processes (see for example Elliot (2014) on the horse meat scandal).

4.2 The who of justice: sites and scales of justice in food security frames

The food security frames identified in the UK media engage more actively in constructing different sites and scales of justice than in defining the matter of justice. The analysis reveals a polarised position between whether the **sites subject to justice** are individual behaviours or the institutions of the basic structure and consequently support very distinct policy interventions. In the first case, the *individualistic* frame portrays food security as an individual matter, the site of justice or who is responsible are individuals instead of institutions. People's attitudes and practices are therefore key to being food secure, and independent from public policies or market forces, mainly understood as "people making the wrong choices".

(Edwina Currie) declared that food poverty simply did not exist. "It's about choices", she said. What she meant was that she believed poor people had enough money, they just spent it on fags and booze and getting into debt with loan sharks. (The Guardian 03/03/2014).

In the UK, this frame has actively been deployed throughout the food banks debate contesting the reach or even existence of food poverty in the country. In this context, some commentators have argued that some people are taking advantage of the welfare system and charity initiatives and call for subsequent policy reform.

Some people like to believe that there has been this enormous upsurge in food poverty. My point is that there have always been poor people in this country.(...)The fact is that food banks are a new phenomenon. (...)If you provide a service, people use it (Daily Mail 13/03/2014).

In a more nuanced position, the *solidarity frame* as deployed in the media avoids pointing out specific sites of justice, trying to de-politicise food security solutions through an appeal to build strong, active and self-reliant communities. In this line, these communities would not expect support from the state, what makes this discourse of building a 'Big Society'⁵ compatible with elements of the individualistic frame that locate individual freedom and responsibility at its heart. Similarly, these ideas of individual freedom and responsibility resonate with the *technological* and *free-trade* frame. These last two emphasise individual freedom particularly in relation to consumer and producer choice that is, by and large, materialised through access to global food chains. Nevertheless, these frames recognise the role of the state in delivering reforms that would progress in solving food insecurity by reinforcing free competition or the introduction of specific technologies.

The Government sometimes says it can't do anything about the rise in food prices, but there are policies that can be adopted. On commodity prices, we need to double our efforts to support free-trade agreements in agricultural goods, support global adoption of high-yield crops and put food production at the heart of our development programmes abroad. (The Telegraph 19/06/2014)

The Environment, Food and Rural Affairs select committee urged ministers to do more to bring in GM food and to get the EU to loosen curbs on the controversial crops to boost "food security" (The Mirror 01/07/2014)

On a different note, the *regulatory* frame emphasises the responsibility of the national state to deliver food security for all, deeming markets as inefficient tools that ignore

⁵ The idea of the 'Big society' in the UK is by and large mostly associated with the conservative agenda which aims to integrate a free market approach with a theory of social solidarity based on voluntarism (Alcock et al., 2012). This concept commends that a significant amount of responsibility for the running of a society is devolved to local communities and volunteers.

environmental, social and economic costs or the need to fulfil human rights, as illustrated below.

Finally, there is an answer that lies in treating food security as a priority, rather than as a soft commodity to be traded like any other. Its production and trading should be much more heavily regulated, and protected (The Guardian 01/06/2011).

(Tory MP) Laura Sandys called for ministers to take a stronger regulatory approach to tackle rampant food inflation, to prevent consumers being ripped off, and to rebuild the UK's consumer's declining food skills. That meant controlling food policy she said, rather than delegating it to the supermarkets (The Guardian 04/06/2013).

The *safety frame* is also related to the regulatory frame, considering necessary the state intervention to regulate specific areas such as developing hygienic bureaucratic norms to assure minimum standards. Nevertheless, food frauds and scares have brought to the fore contrasting positions on responsibility, that is, whether food safety should be more regulated and monitored by public agencies or be devolved to the private sector.

The *distributive justice frame* clearly posits socio-economic structures as the main root cause of food insecurity in the UK, and therefore also proposes that the principles of justice should be applied to institutions - which play a key role in solving unjust situations such as food insecurity. Indeed, this frame advocates for an improved welfare system and other forms of state intervention including raising minimum wages.

Trussell Trust's chairman, said: 'In the last year we've seen things get worse, rather than better, for many people on low incomes.' In a highly political intervention, he also called for the Government to drop sanctions against benefit claimants and increase the minimum wage (Daily Mail 17/04/2014).

The polarised positions around individuals or structures as legitimate sites of justice permeate the definition of the **scales of justice** where the analysis reveals three main levels: global, national and local (including communities). By and large, the frames championing the institutions of the basic structure as a site of justice resort to the national level. For example, in the case of *distributive justice* the institutions pointed out as key for solving food insecurity are located at the national level and mostly relate to the UK's socio-economic policies. In this regard, global discourses around food security for all are rarely included in media articles tackling 'food poverty' in the UK and therefore

restrict their definition of the who of justice to national boundaries. This particularly contrasts with debates and proposals of environmental justice which impinge upon global rights, and reinforces the idea that food justice claims tend to remain local and potentially exclusionary. The *regulatory* and *safety* frame also refers mostly to UK's responsibilities towards its citizens.

Interestingly, the *individualistic* frame champions individual responsibility mostly in relation to the UK context but also in some cases this narrative is applied to justify why other countries are food insecure (e.g. due to corruption, mismanagement or lack of knowledge). While the individualistic frame is very much constructed around the UK and its particular dynamics, it does not necessarily stress the 'nation' as the scale where justice principles and norms are implemented. However, as stated above, it does mobilise nationality and national borders to construct a compelling narrative.

The *productionist* and the *technology* frame reinforce this global scale of justice, asserting that by increasing food production and developing technologies to increase yields in the UK and abroad, they are contributing to global food security.

Children are going blind in impoverished parts of the world because of the "hang-up" of opponents of GM foods, Environment Secretary Owen Paterson warned today (The Evening Standard, 14/10/2013).

At the other end of the spectrum, the *quality* frame celebrates - among other attributes - local food or British food, putting emphasis on high-quality products, grow-your-own or initiatives such as farmers' markets. Some commentators argue that this construction of quality is linked to middle-class concerns that create exclusive spaces where these types of food can be accessed (see for example Guthman, 2008). In this frame, local/national and indigenous foods are presented as part of the British identity. Nevertheless, uncritical approaches to local food have been reported as detrimental in terms of advancing towards equality, since they might reproduce power relations and also develop narratives only accessible to certain societal groups with specific cultural and economic endowments (Johnston, 2008; Moragues-Faus, 2016). This potential 'local' trap permeates the construction of justice developed by the *solidarity* frame where solutions to food insecurity revolve around the devolution of powers to communities and the

promotion of solidarity spirit by encouraging people to take an active role in their local environment.

In Oxford, a food bank was started up four and a half years ago, based on a sustainable model. (...)As an example of the much-disparaged "Big Society", it could hardly be bettered. The volunteers – who (...) come from every background and represent every political hue – have co-operated to build an organisation with local roots, serving local needs, without any subsidy from state sources whatsoever. (The Telegraph 19/06/2014).

This local focus might potentially obscure the distinct capacity of communities to self-organise and tackle food insecurity. Indeed, having 'time' to engage in alternative practices or voluntary activities often requires a pre-existing class privilege (Gross, 2009). Furthermore, this local community focus can reinforce negative unintended consequences of particular food practices on distant communities given the globalised character of existing food chains. Recent literature on food banks has been active in highlighting how food assistance programmes can indeed reproduce root causes of food insecurity and domination relations (see for example (Minkoff-Zern, 2014)).

Table 3. Analysis of food security frames under justice framework

Challenges	The what of justice			The who of justice	
Dimensions Frames	<i>Economic: Redistribution</i>	<i>Social and cultural: Recognition</i>	<i>Political: Representation</i>	<i>Scales of justice</i>	<i>Sites of justice</i>
<i>Distributive justice</i>	Outcomes and opportunities to be food secure	Difference (vulnerable groups but not diverse definitions of good food), sameness (it can happen to you)	Application	National	Structure
<i>Ecological</i>	Outcomes around environmental protection	-	*Future generations	Global	-
<i>Food Safety</i>	Outcomes to be food secure	-	*Scientific evidence	National	Structure
<i>Free trade</i>	Opportunities (countries)	Sameness (trade agreements, free competition)	Application	Global	Individual
<i>Individualistic</i>	Opportunities to access food	Sameness but disregard of certain groups as less deserving	Application	National/global	Individual
<i>Productionist</i>	-	-	-	Global	-
<i>Quality</i>	-	-	-	Local	-
<i>Regulatory</i>	-	-	-	National	Structure
<i>Solidarity</i>	Opportunities	-	-	Local	Not structures
<i>Sovereignty</i>	Opportunities (access to food but also rights) and outcomes	-	Production of justice	Global/local	Structures
<i>Technology</i>	-	-	*Scientific evidence	Global	Individual

5. Neoliberal and structural justice narratives in food security debates

The analysis of media food security frames under the justice framework allows identifying new linkages and gaps that result in the characterisation of two main justice narratives. Firstly, the free trade, individualistic and technology frames share a *neoliberal justice* narrative revolving around providing equal opportunities, championing application of principles and identifying individual practices as key sites of justice. The scale of this neoliberal narrative is rather fluid, with a strong global focus but favouring the interests and needs of a particular nation and its citizens. The term neoliberal justice has been used in the literature to emphasise a formulation of justice that reduces the explanations of social and political theory to the behaviour of individual actors rather than structures of society (Okereke, 2007), as well highlighting its connection to the neoliberal project based on “liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms within an institutional framework characterised by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade” (Harvey, 2005:2). However, the neoliberal justice narrative in food security public debate combines this policy framework with ideas of sameness and equal opportunities to access markets or jobs.

Secondly, the distributive justice, food safety and regulatory frames construct a *structural justice* narrative that not only focuses on opportunities but is largely occupied with the actual outcomes and the application of justice principles. These principles are applied to the institutions of the basic structure primarily located at the national level. The term structural injustice has been used to reject individualising and blaming justice perspectives. According to Young (2006) “structural injustice exists when social processes put large categories of persons under a systematic threat of domination or deprivation of the means to develop and exercise their capacities, at the same time as these processes enable others to dominate or have a wide range of opportunities for developing and exercising their capacities” (p.114). Nevertheless, and contrarily to the narrow structural justice narrative used in food security debates, Young argues that “individuals bear responsibility for structural injustice because they contribute by their actions to the processes that produce unjust outcome” (p.119). Consequently, the “structural processes can be altered only if many actors in diverse social positions work together to intervene in these processes to produce different outcomes” (p.123). However, the structural justice narrative identified throughout the media analysis falls into a rather narrow conceptualisation of structure that hinders the development of a

range of state and non-state led actions to correct current food insecurity dynamics. That is, to propose solutions that go beyond welfare reforms and minimum salaries.

Finally, the rest of the food security frames do not articulate a comprehensive justice narrative. However, they bring to the fore specific aspects of justice such the importance of considering the temporal aspects in the definition of justice (ecological frame), the role of communities and local spaces (solidarity frame) or the importance of questioning how justice is produced (sovereignty frame).

In general, the UK media food security frames show a rather narrow definition of justice in relation to the existing justice literature and its development since the 70s - when liberal definitions of justice started to be contested. Nevertheless, the results of the analysis show that justice claims are central in building an appealing food security frame. The *structural justice* narrative constitutes a clear example of this lack of definition and evidences the need to further qualify justice assertions by its proponents - particularly since, according to interviewees, the media frames capture the wider UK food security debate. This narrative aims to bring to the fore social justice goals in the convoluted UK media, however, it fails to articulate a comprehensive account of cultural recognition, over-relying on food banks as a key framing device of food insecurity. This results in a definition of vulnerable groups in relation to food bank users (a characteristic shared by other frames) which highlights specific food practices (mainly at the consumption end) and obscures other roles that as citizens all of us might perform. This focus also excludes different lived experiences of food poverty that do not necessarily include using food banks; as well as different accounts of what is good food. Accordingly, this narrative overlooks the existence of vulnerable distant communities and how proposed policies might contribute to reproduce or mitigate global inequalities. A more systemic account of food security, often absent in food poverty debates, will allow the uncovering of the existing linkages with global processes implicated in current and future food insecurity outcomes such as climate change or food production. As illustrated above, the sole focus on the institutions of the basic structure as the sites of justice precludes establishing these multi-level linkages that acknowledge a contingent geography of injustice. This justice narrative could benefit from engaging with shared responsibility conceptualisations of justice when identifying who is the subject of justice, and therefore its policy targets. Finally, this frame also disregards the importance of participation when addressing

inequality which constitutes a key mechanism to redress structural and root causes of injustice (see Fraser, 2009).

6. Conclusions: reclaiming justice to deliver food security for all

This paper contributes to the current food security agenda by exploring the connections and disconnections of public food security narratives and their relationality through the concept of justice. In order to broaden and deepen the linkages between food security and justice literature, and practice, two key justice challenges (the what and the who of justice) are expounded to build an innovative analytical framework.

The application of this innovative justice framework to the analysis of the UK media food security debate has revealed gaps and ways forward for food security practitioners and the associated scholarship. First, the identification and characterisation of eleven food security frames reveal clear *disconnections* and partial accounts of the systemic nature of food insecurity, including the proposal of disparate solutions and policies (see table 2). These marked contrasts limit the adoption of integral approaches and innovative practices that have proved instrumental in delivering good food for all- as the literature shows elsewhere (see for example Brunori et al., 2013). Secondly, the media frames engage recurrently with different notions of justice, revealing the contingent relationship between food security and justice claims. Furthermore, the concept of justice constitutes a bridging device across narratives that has uncovered *different controversies and relations* than those recurrently portrayed in academic and policy debates. Results of the analysis show a clear polarisation with respect to the economic dimension of justice (with frames championing opportunities vs those focused on outcomes), the cultural dimension (where sameness and recognition of difference are seldom articulated) and the site of justice (whether the application of justice should pivot around individuals or the institutions of the basic structure). These distinct justice definitions have clear policy implications since they support different types of policies, for example by setting targets regarding access to food vs resulting levels of malnutrition (opportunities/outcomes), developing universal policies or working with differentiated groups (sameness/difference), and reinforcing state regulation or reducing public intervention (structure/individual). The UK media frames also showcase a very limited reflection of

the spatial interdependencies implicated in the food system and their role in achieving global food security outcomes, mostly limiting policies or actors' interventions to the national interest.

Despite the centrality of justice in popular perceptions of food security in the UK, the analysis reveals a partial engagement with justice definitions and a general overlooking of the political dimension of justice – linked to (mis)representation and participation. Yet, explicit problematisation of who participates in decision-making process and whose rights and values are recognised has proven to be essential in resolving entrenched inequalities (see Martinez-Alier, 2014). This lack of engagement in public discourse with the ideas espoused in the participative justice literature mirrors the deficiencies of academic contributions (see Loo, 2014). Furthermore, experts interviewed acknowledged that the media frames identified captured the wider public and policy food security debate; thus signalling a generalised failure of civil society, public and private stakeholders to include the process of producing justice in current narratives and policy solutions.

In this context, the justice framework proposed is instrumental to unpick further these linkages between food security and justice. This framework provides a tool to evaluate justice assertions but also prompt polarised narratives and associated stakeholders to evaluate (and further define) what type and whose justice they are championing. Specifically, this analytical tool acknowledges the role of framing as a key mechanism of generating injustice at the economic and social level (Fraser, 2008) by creating powerful discourses that outline who is subject to what justice principles and producing social realities that translate into targets for policy. This type of analytical tool contributes to the implementation of deliberative and reflexive food governance approaches based on fostering spaces for learning and adapting social solutions to collectively resolve food insecurities (Marsden, 2013). For example, using justice as a bridging concept we start to ask individualistic narratives how they address cultural diversity and different notions of good food, or how distributive justice proponents tackle the global scale to actually deliver good food for all. Similarly, this framework brings to the forefront different questions to elucidate in food policy arenas such as where is the site of responsibility or who is deserving to be considered in food security interventions. Ultimately, linking food security narratives to the justice framework can help to develop integrative and

participative policies that cut across scales, sites and dimensions of justice in order to deliver good food for all.

Consequently, this framework aims not only to guide critique but also to support the creation of counter and equally compelling narratives which can begin to reconstruct a more democratic and inclusive food politics (Moragues-Faus, 2016). This paper proposes to use justice as a common thread to hold new discussions and connect food policy arenas to other spaces tackling socio-economic, cultural and political inequalities. Furthermore, and building on Young's and Fraser's work, I contend that a food security approach that aims to provide consistently good food for all needs to incorporate a definition of justice that i) provides opportunities to access good food with a strong emphasis on final outcomes, ii) appeals to the equal rights of all peoples to food but also acknowledges different needs and definitions of good; and iii) includes the potential for people to participate fully in the conditions, situations and decisions that give rise to particular distributions of goods and bads in the first place. Recognising and unpacking the political elements of justice that are clearly manifested through representation and misrepresentation processes are key to advancing in the current conceptualisations and practices of participative food justices.

Truly participative food justices necessarily depart from the acknowledgment of the global processes that connect individuals and institutions across different geographies. Indeed, multi-scalar approaches to food security and justice are essential to grasp contemporary fluid liaisons between place and power (Bauman, 2013; Conversi, 2016) which are currently fostering the emergence of multilevel, cross-sectorial and multi-site networks that do not conform to administrative boundaries, ranging from transnational corporations to sustainable food cities networks or global justice movements. This multi-scalar approach provides the grounds to dissolve individual-structure dichotomies and build shared responsibilities to deliver global and participative food justices.

References

Agyeman, J., McEntee, J., 2014. Moving the Field of Food Justice Forward Through the Lens of Urban Political Ecology. *Geogr. Compass* 8, 211–220.

- Alcock, P., Kendall, J., Parry, J., 2012. From the third sector to the Big Society: consensus or contention in the 2010 UK General Election? *Volunt. Sect. Rev.* 3, 347–363.
- Alkon, A., 2014. Food Justice and the Challenge to Neoliberalism. *Gastron. J. Food Cult.* 14, 27–40.
- Barnett, C., 2012. Situating the geographies of injustice in democratic theory. *Geoforum* 43, 677–686.
- Barnett, C., 2011. Geography and ethics: Justice unbound. *Prog. Hum. Geogr.* 35, 246–255.
- Bauman, Z., 2013. *Liquid modernity*. Jogn Wiley & Sons.
- Brotherton, A., Simmonds, N., Stroud, M., 2010. Malnutrition Matters Meeting Quality Standards in Nutritional Care [WWW Document]. Br. Assoc. Parenter. Enter. Nutr. (BAPEN). URL <http://www.bapen.org.uk/pdfs/toolkit-for-commissioners.pdf> (accessed 8.19.14).
- Brunori, G., Malandrino, V., Rossi, A., 2013. Trade-off or convergence? The role of food security in the evolution of food discourse in Italy. *J. Rural Stud.* 29, 19–29.
- Buchanan, A., 2003. *Justice, Legitimacy, and Self-Determination: Moral Foundations for International Law*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Cadieux, K., Slocum, R., 2015. What does it mean to do food justice. *J. Polit. Ecol.* 22, 1–26.
- Candel, J.J.L., Breeman, G.E., Stiller, S.J., Termeer, C.J.A.M., 2014. Disentangling the consensus frame of food security: The case of the EU Common Agricultural Policy reform debate. *Food Policy* 44, 47–58.
- Clancy, K., 1994. Commentary social justice and sustainable agriculture: Moving beyond theory. *Agric. Human Values* 11, 77–83.
- Cohen, G., 2009. *Rescuing justice and equality*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Conversi, D., 2016. Sovereignty in a Changing World: From Westphalia to Food Sovereignty. *Globalizations* 13, 484–498.
- DEFRA, 2014a. *Basic Horticultural Statistics 2014*. London.
- DEFRA, 2014b. *Food Statistics Pocketbook 2014*.
- Department for Work and Pensions, 2014. *Households below average income (HBAI): 1994/95 to 2012/13*.
- Elliot, C., 2014. *Elliott Review into the Integrity and Assurance of Food Supply Networks . A national Food Crime Prevention Network*, HM G.
- Entman, R., 1993. Framing: Towards clarification of a fractured paradigm. *J. Commun.* 43, 51–58.
- European Commission, 2010. *The EU Role in Global Health*. COM(2010)128 final. Accessed 01/03/2017 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52010DC0128>

- FAO, 2002. The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2001. Rome.
- Ferguson, J., 2010. The Uses of Neoliberalism. *Antipode* 41, 166–184.
- Fraser, N., 2008. Scales of justice: Reimagining justice in a globalizing world. Polity, Cambridge.
- Fraser, N., 1997. Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the “postsocialist” condition. Routledge, New York.
- Freibauer, A., Mathijs, E., O’Brien, L., Treyer, S., 2011. Sustainable Food Consumption and Production in a Resource-Constrained World (Report), European Commission – Standing Committee on Agricultural Research (SCAR). The 3rd SCAR Foresight Exercise .
- Garnett, T., Godfray, C., 2012. Sustainable intensification in agriculture. Navigating a course through competing food system priorities.
- Godfray HCJ, Beddington JR, Crute IR, et al. (2010) Food security: the challenge of feeding 9 billion people. *Science* 327(5967): 812–818.
- Gordon, D., Levitas, R., Pantazis, C., Patsios, D., Payne, S., Townsend, P., Adelman, L., Ashworth, K., Middleton, S., Bradshaw, J., Williams, J., 2000. Poverty and social exclusion in Britain, Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Gottlieb, R., Joshi, A., 2010. Food justice. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Gross, J., 2009. Capitalism and Its Discontents: Back-to-the-Lander and Freegan Foodways in Rural Oregon. *Food Foodways* 17, 57–79.
- Guthman, J., 2008. Bringing good food to others: investigating the subjects of alternative food practice. *Cult. Geogr.* 15, 431–447.
- Harvey, D., 2005. A brief history of neoliberalism. Oxford University Press, USA, Oxford.
- Harvey, D., 1992. Social Justice, Postmodernism and the City. *Int. J. Urban Reg. Res.* 16, 588–601.
- Herman, E.S. and Chomsky, N., 1988 Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media. Pantheon Books, USA.
- Heider, F., 1958. The psychology of interpersonal relations. Wiley, New York.
- Heynen, N., 2010. Cooking up non-violent civil-disobedient direct action for the hungry: ‘Food Not Bombs’ and the resurgence of radical democracy in the US. *Urban Stud.* 47, 1225–1240.
- Holt Gimenez, E., Shattuck, A., 2011. Food crises, food regimes and food movements: rumblings of reform or tides of transformation? *J. Peasant Stud.* 38, 109–144.
- Hopma J and Woods M (2014) Political Geographies of ‘Food Security’ and ‘Food Sovereignty’. *Geography Compass* 8(11): 773–784.
- HSE, 2013. Health Survey for England - 2012. (mr) Web Master, United Kingdom.
- Iyengar, S., 1994. Is Anyone Responsible?: How Television Frames Political Issues. University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.
- Jarosz, L., 2014. Comparing food security and food sovereignty discourses. *Dialogues*

- Hum. Geogr. 4, 168–181.
- Johnston, J., 2008. The citizen-consumer hybrid: ideological tensions and the case of Whole Foods Market. *Theory Soc.* 37, 229–270. doi:10.1007/s11186-007-9058-5
- Kirwan, J., Maye, D., 2013. Food security framings within the UK and the integration of local food systems. *J. Rural Stud.* 29, 91–100.
- Kneafsey, M., Dowler, E., Lambie-Mumford, H., Inman, A., Collier, R., 2013. Consumers and food security: Uncertain or empowered? *J. Rural Stud.* 29, 101–112.
- Lambie-Mumford, H., Crossley, D., Jensen, E., Verbeke, M., Dowler, E., 2014. Household Food Security in the UK: A Review of Food Aid [WWW Document]. Dep. Environ. Food Rural Aff. URL https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/283071/household-food-security-uk-140219.pdf (accessed 12.16.14).
- Lang T and Barling D (2012) Food security and food sustainability: reformulating the debate. *The Geographical Journal* 178(4): 313–326.
- Little, J., Austin, P., 1996. Women and the rural idyll. *J. Rural Stud.* 12, 101–111.
- Loo, C., 2014. Towards a More Participative Definition of Food Justice. *J. Agric. Environ. Ethics* 27, 787–809.
- MacMillan, T., Dowler, E., 2012. Just and sustainable? Examining the rhetoric and potential realities of UK food security. *J. Agric. Environ. ethics* 1–24.
- Marsden, T., 2013. From post-productionism to reflexive governance: Contested transitions in securing more sustainable food futures. *J. Rural Stud.* 29, 123–134.
- Martinez-Alier, J., 2014. The environmentalism of the poor. *Geoforum* 54, 239–241.
- Miller, D., 2008. National responsibility and global justice. *Crit. Rev. Int. Soc. Polit. Philos.* 11, 383–399.
- Minkoff-Zern, L.-A., 2014. Subsidizing farmworker hunger: Food assistance programs and the social reproduction of California farm labor. *Geoforum* 57, 91–98.
- Misselhorn A, Aggarwal P, Ericksen P, et al. (2012) A vision for attaining food security. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 4(1): 7–17.
- Mooney, P.H., Hunt, S.A., 2009. Food Security: The Elaboration of Contested Claims to a Consensus Frame*. *Rural Sociol.* 74, 469–497.
- Moragues-Faus, A., 2016. Emancipatory or neoliberal food politics? Exploring the “politics of collectivity” of buying groups in the search for egalitarian food democracies. *Antipode* 49: 455–476 .
- Moragues-Faus, A., Morgan, K., 2015. Reframing the foodscape: the emergent world of urban food policy. *Environ. Plan. A* 47, 1558–1573.
- Murdoch, J., Lowe, P., Ward, N., Marsden, T., 2003. *The Differentiated Countryside*. Routledge , London.
- Nally, D., 2014. Governing precarious lives: land grabs, geopolitics, and “food security.” *Geogr. J.* n/a-n/a.
- Nelson, T., Clawson, R.A., Oxley, Z.M., 1997. Media framing of a civil liberties conflict and

- its effect on tolerance. *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.* 91, 567–583.
- Nussbaum, M., 2003. CAPABILITIES AS FUNDAMENTAL ENTITLEMENTS: SEN AND SOCIAL JUSTICE. *Fem. Econ.* 9, 33–59.
- O'Connor, J., 1998. *Natural causes: Essays in ecological Marxism*. Guilford Press, New York.
- Okereke, C., 2007. *Global justice and neoliberal environmental governance: ethics, sustainable development and international co-operation*. Routledge, London; New York.
- Oxfam and Church Action, 2013. *Walking the Breadline: The scandal of food poverty in 21st-century Britain*.
- Oxfam, 2013. *The Power of People against Poverty*. Accessed 01/03/2017 <https://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/oxfam-strategic-plan-2013-2019.pdf>
- Pan, Z., Kosicki, G., 1993. Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Polit. Commun.* 10, 55–75.
- Pogge, T., 2002. Moral universalism and global economic justice, in: *World Poverty and Human Rights: Cosmopolitan Responsibilities and Reforms*. Polity Press, Cambridge, pp. 91–117.
- Rawls, J., 1999. *The Law of Peoples*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Rawls, J., 1971. *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Sampei, Y., Aoyagi-Usui, M., 2009. Mass-media coverage, its influence on public awareness of climate-change issues, and implications for Japan's national campaign to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. *Glob. Environ. Chang.* 19, 203–212.
- Sbicca, J., 2012. Growing food justice by planting an anti-oppression foundation: opportunities and obstacles for a budding social movement. *Agric. Human Values* 29, 455–466.
- Sen, A., 2009. *The idea of justice*. Harvard University Press, Harvard.
- Sikor, T., Newell, P., 2014. Globalizing environmental justice? *Geoforum* 54, 151–157.
- Singer, P., 1993. *Practical Ethics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Smith, D.M., 2000. Social justice revisited. *Environ. Plan. A* 32, 1149–1162. doi:10.1068/a3258
- Sonnino, R., Marsden, T., Moragues-Faus, A., 2016. Relationalities and convergences in food security narratives: towards a place-based approach. *Trans. Inst. Br. Geogr.* 41: 477–489
- Sonnino, R., Moragues-Faus, A., Maggio, A., 2014. Sustainable Food Security: An Emerging Research and Policy Agenda. *Int. J. Sociol. Agric. Food* 21, 173–188.
- Unger, P., 1996. *Living high and letting die: Our illusion of innocence*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Walker, P.A., 2006. Political ecology: where is the policy? *Prog. Hum. Geogr.* 30, 382–

395.

Wells, R., Caraher, M., 2014. UK print media coverage of the food bank phenomenon: from food welfare to food charity? *Br. Food J.* 116, 1426–1445.

Young, I., 2011. *Responsibility for Justice*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Young, I., 2007. *Global Challenges: War, Self- determination and Responsibility*. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Young, I., 2006. Responsibility and global justice: A social connection model. *Soc. Philos. Policy*.

Young, I.M., 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton University press, Princeton.